arXiv:physics/0607040v1 [physics.atom-ph] 5 Jul 2006

Inner-shell excitation of open-shell atoms: A spin-dependent localized Hartree-Fock density-functional calculation

Zhongyuan Zhou[1,2] and Shih-I Chu[1]
[1]*Department of Chemistry, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045*
[2]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045*

(Received July 5, 2006)

Abstract

The spin-dependent localized Hartree-Fock (SLHF) density-functional approach is extended to the treatment of the inner-shell excited-state calculation of open-shell atomic systems. In this approach, the electron spin-orbitals in an electronic configuration are obtained by solving Kohn-Sham (KS) equation with SLHF exchange potential and the Slater's diagonal sum rule is used to evaluate the multiplet energy of an inner-shell excited state from the single-Slater-determinant energies of the electronic configurations involved. This approach together with the correlation potentials and energy functionals proposed by Perdew and Wang's (PW) or Lee, Yang, and Parr's (LYP) have been used to calculate the total and excitation energies of inner-shell excited states of open-shell atomic systems: Li, B, Ne^{+}, Ne^{2+}, Ne^{3+}, and Na. The results with the PW and LYP energy functionals are in overall good agreement with each other and also with available experimental and other *ab initio* theoretical data. Some new results for highly excited inner-shell states are presented.

PACS numbers: 31.15.Ew, 32.80.Wr, 32.80.Rm

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to computational simplicity and efficiency [1, 2] density functional theory (DFT) [3, 4] has been widely applied to many areas in theoretical physics and chemistry as a powerful *ab initio* approach for the calculation of ground-state properties of many-electron systems. The basic equation of DFT is Kohn-Sham (KS) equation [4] and the key part in KS equation is exchange-correlation (XC) potential [5]. Due to incomplete cancellation of spurious self-interactions and inherent degeneracy (due to the use of spin and angular-momentum independent local potentials) of traditional XC potentials obtained from uniform electron gas, such as local density approximation (LDA) [1, 2] and generalized gradient approximation (GGA) [1, 6, 7, 8, 9], the conventional DFT using LDA or GGA is a ground-state approach. The differences of the KS energy eigenvalues of unoccupied and occupied orbitals are not rigorously defined as excitation energies. However, the KS energy eigenvalues can serve as good zeroth-order excited-state energies provided they are obtained by solving KS equation with a high-quality XC potential [10]. A number of theoretical methods have been developed by adopting this point of view [11]. In particular, density work-functional approach (WF) [12, 13, 14, 15], open-shell localized Hartree-Fock (LHF) density-functional approach [16, 17, 18, 19], and multireference LHF density-functional approach [20, 21], etc., have been successfully used to calculate excited-state properties of atomic and molecular systems.

Recently, an exchange (X)-only LHF density-functional theory has been proposed and successfully applied to ground-state calculations of atomic and molecular systems [10]. In this X-only DFT, the exchange potential in the KS equation is a LHF exchange potential derived under the assumption that X-only KS determinant is equal to the Hartree-Fock (HF) determinant. We have recently extended this approach to excited states of atomic and molecular systems by assuming that the X-only KS determinant is also equal to the HF determinant for excited states [22]. Based on this postulate we have developed a spin-dependent localized Hartree-Fock (SLHF) density-functional approach for excited-state calculation of atomic and molecular systems [22]. In this approach, the exchange potential in the KS equation is an exact nonvariational SLHF exchange potential constructed for both the ground and excited states. The SLHF potential is an analogue of the LHF potential. It is self-interaction free and exhibits the correct long-range behavior. Further, the SLHF potential requires the use of only the occupied orbitals and is dependent of the orbital symmetry of the state. This approach associating with Slater's diagonal sum rule [23] has been successfully used to calculate multiply excited states of valence electrons of atomic systems [22] and inner-shell excitation of close-shell atomic systems [24] with accurate results.

In this paper, we extend the SLHF density-functional approach to inner-shell excited states of open-shell atomic systems. We compute the total and excitation energies of inner-shell excited states of open-shell atomic systems: Li, B, Ne^{+}, Ne^{2+}, Ne^{3+}, and Na. In the calculation, the correlation potentials and energy functionals proposed by Perdew and Wang (PW) [9] and by Lee, Yang, and Parr (LYP) [8] are used to estimate electron correlation effect. We will show that the calculated results are in overall good agreement with available theoretical and experimental data. We also present some new results for the highly excited inner-shell states for the first time.

II. THEORETICAL METHOD

The SLHF density-functional approach has been discussed in Ref. [22] in detail and is outlined in this section for convenience.

In spin-dependent density-functional approach, a spin-orbital $\varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$ of the ith electron with spin σ ($\sigma = \alpha$ and β for spin-up and spin-down, respectively) and its orbital energy $\varepsilon_{i\sigma}$ are determined by the KS equation

$$H_\sigma(\mathbf{r})\varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) = \varepsilon_{i\sigma}\varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r}), \qquad (1)$$

where,

$$H_\sigma(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + V_\sigma^{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r}), \qquad (2)$$

is the KS Hamiltonian and

$$V_\sigma^{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r}) = V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) + V_H(\mathbf{r}) + V_{xc\sigma}(\mathbf{r}), \qquad (3)$$

is the local effective potential. In Eq. (3), $V_{ext}(\mathbf{r})$ is the external potential, $V_H(\mathbf{r})$ is Hartree potential (classical Coulomb electrostatic potential between electrons), and $V_{xc\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$ is the XC potential.

For a given atomic system, the external potential $V_{ext}(\mathbf{r})$ is known exactly. The Hartree potential $V_H(\mathbf{r})$ is given by

$$V_H(\mathbf{r}) = \int \frac{\rho(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}d\mathbf{r}', \qquad (4)$$

where, $\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) + \rho_\beta(\mathbf{r})$ is the total electron density and $\rho_\sigma(\mathbf{r})$ (for $\sigma = \alpha$ and β) is the spin-dependent electron density defined by

$$\rho_\sigma(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_\sigma} w_{i\sigma}|\varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r})|^2. \qquad (5)$$

Here N_σ is the number of electrons with spin σ and $w_{i\sigma}$ is the occupied number of electrons in the spin-orbital $\varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$.

The XC potential can be decomposed into the exchange potential $V_{x\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$ and the correlation potential $V_{c\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$. In the SLHF density-functional approach, the exchange potential is a SLHF exchange potential $V_{x\sigma}^{\text{SLHF}}(\mathbf{r})$. It is given by

$$V_{x\sigma}^{\text{SLHF}}(\mathbf{r}) = V_{x\sigma}^{\text{S}}(\mathbf{r}) + V_{x\sigma}^{\text{C}}(\mathbf{r}), \qquad (6)$$

where,

$$V_{x\sigma}^{\text{S}}(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{1}{\rho_\sigma(\mathbf{r})}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N_\sigma}\gamma_{ij}^\sigma(\mathbf{r})\int\frac{\gamma_{ij}^\sigma(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}d\mathbf{r}', \qquad (7)$$

is the Slater potential [23] and

$$V_{x\sigma}^{\text{C}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\rho_\sigma(\mathbf{r})}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N_\sigma}\gamma_{ij}^\sigma(\mathbf{r})Q_{ij}^\sigma, \qquad (8)$$

is a correction to Slater potential. In Eqs. (7) and (8) $\gamma_{ij}^\sigma(\mathbf{r})$ and Q_{ij}^σ are defined by

$$\gamma_{ij}^\sigma(\mathbf{r}) = \varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r})\varphi_{j\sigma}(\mathbf{r}), \qquad (9)$$

and

$$Q_{ij}^\sigma = \left\langle\varphi_{j\sigma}\left|V_{x\sigma}^{\text{SLHF}} - V_{x\sigma}^{\text{NL}}\right|\varphi_{i\sigma}\right\rangle, \qquad (10)$$

where, $V_{x\sigma}^{\text{NL}}$ is a nonlocal exchange operator of the form of HF exchange potential but constructed from KS spin-orbitals.

The SLHF exchange potential determined by Eqs. (6)–(10) has two arbitrary additive constants. The physical orbitals can only be obtained by the use of appropriate constants in the exchange potential [10]. To settle down the constants so as to pick up the physical orbitals, it is required that the highest-occupied-orbital N_σ of each spin σ does not contribute to the correction term $V_{x\sigma}^{\text{C}}(\mathbf{r})$. In this case, the correction term $V_{x\sigma}^{\text{C}}(\mathbf{r})$ decays exponentially, the SLHF exchange potential behaves asymptotically as Slater potential and thus approaches to $-1/r$ at long range [10].

In atomic systems, an electron spin-orbital is characterized by three quantum numbers n, l, and σ, where n and l are the principal quantum number and orbital angular momentum quantum number of the electron, respectively. In the spherical coordinates, the spin-orbital $\varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$ of an electron with quantum numbers n, l, and σ can be expressed by

$$\varphi_{i\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{R_{nl\sigma}(r)}{r}Y_{lm}(\theta,\phi), \qquad (11)$$

where, $R_{nl\sigma}(r)$ is the radial spin-orbital, $Y_{lm}(\theta,\phi)$ is the spherical harmonic, m is the azimuthal quantum number, and i is a set of quantum numbers apart from spin σ of the spin-orbital. The radial spin-orbital $R_{nl\sigma}(r)$ is governed by radial KS equation,

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} + v_\sigma^{\text{eff}}(r)\right]R_{nl\sigma} = \varepsilon_{nl\sigma}R_{nl\sigma}, \qquad (12)$$

where $v_\sigma^{\text{eff}}(r)$ is the radial effective potential given by

$$v_\sigma^{\text{eff}}(r) = v_{ext}(r) + v_H(r) + v_{x\sigma}^{\text{SLHF}}(r) + v_{c\sigma}(r). \qquad (13)$$

In Eq. (13), $v_{ext}(r)$, $v_H(r)$, $v_{x\sigma}^{\text{SLHF}}(r)$, and $v_{c\sigma}(r)$ are the radial external potential, radial Hartree potential, radial SLHF exchange potential, and radial correlation potential, respectively.

For an atomic system with a nuclear charge Z, the external potential is the Coulomb potential between electron and nucleus

$$v_{ext}(r) = -\frac{Z}{r}. \qquad (14)$$

In central-field approach, the radial Hartree potential is calculated from

$$v_H(r) = 4\pi\int\frac{1}{r_>}\rho(r')r'^2dr', \qquad (15)$$

where, $r_>$ is the larger of r and r', $\rho(r) = \rho_\alpha(r) + \rho_\beta(r)$ is the spherically averaged total electron density, and $\rho_\sigma(r)$

($\sigma = \alpha$ or β) is the spherically averaged spin-dependent electron density given by

$$\rho_\sigma(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int \rho_\sigma(\mathbf{r})d\Omega = \frac{1}{4\pi}\sum_{nl}^{\nu_\sigma} w_{nl\sigma}\left[\frac{R_{nl\sigma}}{r}\right]^2. \quad (16)$$

Here the symbol ν_σ stands for a set of quantum numbers for summation and the sum is performed over all the occupied spin-orbitals with spin σ. This expression is accurate for spherically symmetric (close-shell) states, but it is only an approximation for non-spherically symmetric (open-shell) states. It may induce an error when it is used to evaluate the energy of a non-spherically symmetric state. However, the error is negligible compared to the order of calculated multiplet splitting [11].

The radial SLHF exchange potential is given by

$$v_{x\sigma}^{\mathrm{SLHF}}(r) = v_{x\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}(r) + v_{x\sigma}^{\mathrm{C}}(r), \quad (17)$$

where,

$$v_{x\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}}(r) = -\frac{1}{4\pi\rho_\sigma(r)}\sum_{nlm}^{\nu_\sigma}\sum_{n'l'm'}^{\nu_\sigma} s_{nlm,n'l'm'}^{\sigma}(r), \quad (18)$$

is the radial Slater potential and

$$v_{x\sigma}^{\mathrm{C}}(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi\rho_\sigma(r)}\sum_{nlm}^{\nu_\sigma}\sum_{n'l'm'}^{\nu_\sigma} c_{nlm,n'l'm'}^{\sigma}(r). \quad (19)$$

is a correction to the radial Slater potential. The matrix elements $s_{nlm,n'l'm'}^{\sigma}(r)$ and $c_{nlm,n'l'm'}^{\sigma}(r)$ in Eq. (19) are given in Ref. [22].

To calculate electron spin-orbital, the Legendre generalized pseudospectral (LGPS) method [25] is used to discretize the radial KS equation (12). This method associated with an appropriate mapping technique can overcome difficulties due to singularity at $r = 0$ and long-tail at large r of Coulomb interaction and thus provides a very effective and efficient numerical algorithm for high-precision solution of KS equation. Using the electron spin-orbitals of an electronic configuration, a single Slater determinant for a specific electronic state is constructed and its total energy calculated. The total energy is a sum of non-interacting kinetic-energy E_k, external-field energy E_{ext}, Hartree energy E_H, exchange energy E_x, and correlation energy E_c. The values of E_k, E_{ext}, E_H, and E_x are evaluated by

$$\begin{aligned} E_k &= \sum_{\sigma=\alpha}^{\beta}\sum_{nl}^{\nu_\sigma} w_{nl\sigma}\int R_{nl\sigma}(r)\left(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dr^2}\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2}\right)R_{nl\sigma}(r)\,dr, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$E_{ext} = 4\pi\int v_{ext}(r)\,\rho(r)\,r^2 dr, \quad (21)$$

$$E_H = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\Pi}\eta_{lm,l'm'}^{k} F_{nl\sigma,n'l'\sigma'}^{k}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$E_x = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\Pi}\lambda_{lm,l'm'}^{k} G_{nl\sigma,n'l'\sigma'}^{k}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}, \quad (23)$$

where, Π represents a collection of all the quantum numbers involved, the matrix elements $\eta_{lm,l'm'}^{k}$, $F_{nl\sigma,n'l'\sigma'}^{k}$, and $G_{nl\sigma,n'l'\sigma'}^{k}$ are given in Ref. [22].

For a multiplet state that can be described completely by a single Slater determinant, the energy is calculated directly from the single Slater determinant. For a multiplet state that cannot be represented by a single determinant, the energy can be calculated by means of Slater's diagonal sum rule [23]. According to this rule, a sum over single-Slater-determinant energy $E(\mathrm{D}_i)$ of determinant D_i from an electron configuration equals to a weighted sum over multiplet energy $E(\mathrm{M}_j)$ of multiplet state M_j involved in the same electron configuration, namely,

$$\sum_i E(\mathrm{D}_i) = \sum_j d_j E(\mathrm{M}_j), \quad (24)$$

where, the weight d_j is the times that the multiplet state M_j appears in all the single Slater determinants. Similar procedures have been employed in recent excited-state calculations [14, 15, 26].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The procedure described in the preceding section is extended to calculate the total energies (E) and excitation energies (ΔE) of inner-shell excited states of open-shell atomic systems: Li, B, Ne^{+}, Ne^{2+}, Ne^{3+}, and Na. In the calculations, the correlation effect, which is characterized by the correlation potential $v_{c\sigma}(r)$ and correlation energy E_c, is taken into account through the correlation potentials and energy functionals of Perdew and Wang (PW) [9] and of Lee, Yang, and Parr (LYP) [8], respectively. The results obtained with these two correlation energy functionals are listed in columns PW and LYP in the following tables, respectively.

A. Inner-shell excitation of Li

Inner-shell excitation of Li has been the subject of extensive experimental and theoretical studies. Both experimental [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35] and theoretical data [36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49] are abundant. In TABLE I to TABLE III we present the total and excitation energies of our calculations with PW and LYP correlation potentials and energy functionals for inner-shell excited states $1s2sns\ ^{2,4}S$ ($n = 2 \sim 8$),

$1s2snp\ ^{2,4}P$ ($n = 2 \sim 8$), and $1s2p^2\ ^2S$, $^{2,4}P$, and ^2D, respectively. For comparison we also list in these tables representative experimental data [29, 31, 34] as well as theoretical results obtained from calculations using density work-functional formalism (WF) [36], saddle-point complex-rotation (SPCR) [37, 38, 39, 40], extensive configuration-interaction calculation (ECI) [43, 44, 45, 46], and Rayleigh-Ritz variational method (RRV) [49].

For the total energies of inner-shell excited states $1s2sns\ ^{2,4}S$ listed in TABLE I, the maximum relative discrepancies of our PW and LYP results are 0.10% and 0.32% to the WF results, 0.21% and 0.43% to the SPCR results, and 0.19% and 0.62% to the ECI results, respectively. This indicates that both the PW and LYP results are in good agreement with WF, SPCR, and ECI results, and the PW results are a little bit better than the LYP results. For the excitation energy of excited state $1s2s^2\ ^2S$, the maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results and the WF results are 0.91%, 1.65%, and 1.25%, respectively, to the experimental results. This demonstrates that the PW result is better than both the LYP and WF results. For excited states $1s2sns\ ^2S$ ($n \geq 3$), other theoretical results of excitation energy are not available. For these states the maximum relative discrepancies of our PW and LYP results of excitation energies to the experimental results are 1.45% and 2.75%, respectively. For the excited state $1s2s3s\ ^4S$, the maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results of excitation energies to the experimental result are 0.75% and 1.60%, respectively. While the maximum relative discrepancies of the ECI and RRV results to the experimental result are 0.59% and 0.50%, respectively. Hence our PW result is in good agreement with both the experimental result and other theoretical results for this state. For excited states $1s2sns\ ^4S$ ($n > 3$) there is no experimental data available. For these states, the maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results to the RRV results are 0.68% and 1.39%, respectively. Thus our PW results are close to the RRV results. For the all the results above the PW results are better than the LYP results. As will be shown, due to overestimation of LYP energy functional to correlation energies of atomic systems with smaller Z [8, 22], the LYP results are generally worse than the PW results for atomic systems with $Z \leq 8$.

For the total energies of excited states $1s2snp\ ^{2,4}P$ given in TABLE II, the maximum relative discrepancies of our PW and LYP results are 0.56% and 0.89% to the WF results, 0.64% and 1.03% to the SPCR results, and 0.25% and 0.82% to the ECI results, respectively. This illustrates that both the PW and LYP results are in agreement with the complicated *ab initio* methods. For the excitation energy of excited state $1s2s2p\ ^4P$, the maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results to the experimental results are 0.38% and 1.66%, while the maximum relative discrepancies of the WF, ECI, and RRV results to the experimental results are 1.423%, 0.03%, and 0.07%, respectively. For excitation energy of the excited state $1s2s2p\ ^2P$, the maximum relative discrepancies of the PW, LYP, and WF results to the experimental result are 0.05%, 1.70%, and 1.85%, respectively. For excitation energy of the state $1s2s3p\ ^2P$, the maximum relative deviations of the PW, LYP, and WF results to the experimental result are 1.35%, 2.73%, and 1.11%, respectively. Thus the PW results are better than the LYP results and a little bit better than the WF results.

For the total energies of inner-shell doubly excited states $1s2p^2\ ^2S$, $^{2,4}P$, and ^2D given in TABLE III, the maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results are 0.63% and 0.75% to the WF results, 0.47% and 0.78% to both the SPCR and ECI results, respectively. This demonstrates that the PW energy functional has almost the same precision as the LYP energy functional in calculation of total energies of these inner-shell excited states. For excitation energies, the relative discrepancies of our PW and LYP results to the experimental result are less than 1.10% and 1.50%, respectively, while the maximum relative discrepancies of the WF results to the experimental results are 1.09%. Hence the PW results are very close to the WF results and a little bit better than the LYP results.

B. Inner-shell excitation of B

The second open-shell atom for which the total energies of inner-shell excited states are computed is B. In TABLE IV we present Auger transition energies from the inner-shell excited states $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2S$, $^{2,4}P$, and ^2D of B to the singly excited states $1s^22s2p\ ^{1,3}P$ and the doubly excited states $1s^22p^2\ ^1S$, ^3P, and ^1D of B^+. For comparison we also give in this table the available experimental results [34] as well as theoretical results from WF [36], perturbation Z-expansion theory (PZE) [50, 51], and perturbation Z-expansion theory with relativistic effects (RPZE) [34]. Except for the transitions $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2D \rightarrow 1s^22p^2\ ^1S$ and $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2S \rightarrow 1s^22p^2\ ^1S$, the maximum deviations of our PW and LYP results to the experimental results are 0.634% and 0.241%, while the maximum discrepancies of the WF, PZE, and RPZE results to the experimental results are 0.783%, 1.211%, and 0.4091%, respectively. This indicates that our results are much better than the PZE results, a little bit better than the WF results, and much closer to the RPZE results. The maximum deviations of the PW, LYP, PZE, and RPZE results to the experimental results are 1.821%, 1.033%, 3.257%, and 0.07% for the transition $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2D \rightarrow 1s^22p^2\ ^1S$ and 0.437%, 1.232%, 1.392%, and 0.04% for the transition $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2S \rightarrow 1s^22p^2\ ^1S$, respectively. This indicates again that our results are better than the PZE results. In addition, according to our result the spectrum line with 170.7 eV previously signed to the transition $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2D \rightarrow 1s^22p^2\ ^1S$ may likely belong to the transition $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2D \rightarrow 1s^22p^2\ ^3P$.

TABLE I: Total energies (E) and excitation energies (ΔE) of inner-shell excited states $1s2sns$ $^{2,4}S$ ($n = 2 \sim 8$) of Li. The ground state energies obtained from calculations with PW and LYP correlation potentials and energy functionals are -7.4837 (a.u.) and -7.4872 (a.u.), respectively. Here 1 a.u.=27.2116 eV is used.

States	$-E$		(a.u.)					ΔE			(eV)		
	Present	work	Other		theory	Present	work	Other		theory		Exp.	
	PW^a	LYP^b	WF^c	SPCR^d	ECI^e	PW^a	LYP^b	WF^c	ECI^e	RRV^f	ZBS^g	RPR^h	RBB^i
$1s2s^2$ ^2S	5.3940	5.3822	5.3994	5.4052		56.8641	57.2796	57.055			56.352	56.395	56.362
$1s2s3s$ ^4S	5.2225	5.2451			5.2127	61.5317	61.0114		61.637	61.69		62.00	
^2S	5.2019*	5.1466*				62.0917*	63.6907*				61.995		62.012*
	5.1475†	5.1418†				63.5728†	63.8310†						63.192†
$1s2s4s$ ^4S	5.1703	5.1918				62.9513	62.4615		63.113	63.18			
^2S	5.1288	5.1022				64.0806	64.8999				63.17	63.16	63.292
$1s2s5s$ ^4S	5.1508	5.1715				63.4819	63.0142			63.73			
^2S	5.1108	5.0855				64.5704	65.3549						63.792
$1s2s6s$ ^4S	5.1412	5.1616				63.7432	63.2847			63.99			
^2S	5.1018	5.0772				64.8153	65.5810						
$1s2s7s$ ^4S	5.1358	5.1560				63.8901	63.4370			64.33			
^2S	5.0966	5.0724				64.9568	65.7100						
$1s2s8s$ ^4S	5.1324	5.1525				63.9826	63.5315						
^2S	5.0933	5.0695				65.0466	65.7909						

^{a}PW results, ^{b}LYP results, ^{c}[36], ^{d}[37], ^{e}[43, 44], ^{f}[49], ^{g}[29], ^{h}[31], and ^{i}[34]. Here, *for $1s2s(^3S)3s$ ^2S and †for $1s2s(^1S)3s$ ^2S.

TABLE II: Total energies (E) and excitation energies (ΔE) of inner-shell excited states $1s2snp$ $^{2,4}P$ ($n = 2 \sim 8$) of Li.

States	$-E$		(a.u.)					ΔE			(eV)		
	Present	work	Other		theory	Present	work	Other		theory		Exp.	
	PW^a	LYP^b	WF^c	SPCR^d	ECI^e	PW^a	LYP^b	WF^c	ECI^e	RRV^f	ZBS^g	RPR^h	RBB^i
$1s2s2p$ ^4P	5.3811	5.4117	5.4114	5.3678	5.3679	57.2151	56.4777	56.728	57.413	57.47	57.385	57.41	57.432
^2P	5.3177*	5.2854*	5.2912	5.3133*		58.9403*	59.9145*	59.999			58.912*	58.912*	58.912*
	5.2407†	5.2223†		5.2585†		61.0356†	61.6316†				60.397†	60.405†	60.402†
$1s2s3p$ ^4P	5.1994	5.2212	5.2205		5.1873	62.1595	61.6610	61.923	61.262	61.33			
^2P	5.1589	5.1308	5.1767	5.1841		63.2615	64.1220	63.115			62.425	62.421	62.462
$1s2s4p$ ^4P	5.1623	5.1835				63.1690	62.6874						
^2P	5.1232	5.0973				64.2330	65.0330						
$1s2s5p$ ^4P	5.1470	5.1676				63.5853	63.1200						
^2P	5.1081	5.0832				64.6439	65.4167						
$1s2s6p$ ^4P	5.1391	5.1594				63.8003	63.3432						
^2P	5.1003	5.0759				64.8561	65.6153						
$1s2s7p$ ^4P	5.1345	5.1547				63.9255	63.4711						
^2P	5.0956	5.0717				64.9840	65.7296						
$1s2s8p$ ^4P	5.1315	5.1516				64.0071	63.5554						
^2P	5.0928	5.0690				65.0602	65.8031						

^{a}PW results, ^{b}LYP results, ^{c}[36], ^{d}[39, 40], ^{e}[43, 44, 46], ^{f}[49], ^{g}[29], ^{h}[31], and ^{i}[34]. Here, *for $1s(2s2p\ ^3P)$ ^2P and †for $1s(2s2p\ ^1P)$ ^2P.

C. Inner-shell excitation of positive ions Ne$^+$, Ne^{2+}, and Ne$^+$

To explore the feasibility of the approach to inner-shell excitation of atomic ions, we also apply the procedure to inner-shell excited-state calculations of positive ions Ne$^+$, Ne^{2+}, and Ne^{3+}. In TABLE V we present the excitation energies of optically allowed transitions involved in inner-shell excited states of these ions along with the theoretical results of multiconfiguration Dirac-Fock (MCDF) method [52]. Note that the MCDF results here are the weighted-averaged values of those given in [52]. The maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results to the MCDF results are 0.171% and 0.071% for Ne$^+$, 0.162% and 0.059% for Ne^{2+}, and 0.159% and 0.081% for Ne^{3+}, respectively. Thus the agreement of our results with the MCDF results are quite satisfactory, demonstrating that the SLHF together with PW and LYP correlation potentials is accurate for the calculation of inner-shell excited states of Ne positive ions. In addition, the LYP results are more accurate than the PW results for these atomic systems with $Z = 10$ [22, 24].

D. Inner-shell excitation of Na

Finally we compute the total energies and excitation energies for inner-shell excited states $1s2s^22p^63s(^1S)np$ ^2P ($n = 3 \sim 8$) and $1s2s^22p^63s(^3S)np$ $^{2,4}P$ ($n = 3 \sim 8$) of Na. The results are shown in TABLE VI together with the theoretical results from relativistic configuration interaction method (RCI) [53] and multiconfiguration Hartree-Fock method (MCHF) [54] as well as the experimental results (Exp.) [55] for comparison.

For the excitation energies of excited states $1s2s^22p^63s(^1S)np$ ^2P, the relative deviations of our PW and LYP results to the experimental results are not more than 0.18% and 0.07%, respectively. This indicates that both the PW and LYP results are in good agreement with the experimental results and the LYP results are better than the PW results. In addition, the maximum relative discrepancies of our RCI and MCHF

TABLE III: Total energies (E) and excitation energies (ΔE) of inner-shell doubly excited states $1s2p^2\ ^2S$, $^{2,4}P$, and ^2D of Li.

States	$-E$			(a.u.)				ΔE			(eV)		
	Present	work	Other		theory	Present	work	Other		theory		Exp.	
	PW^a	LYP^b	WF^c	SPCR^d	ECI^e	PW^a	LYP^b	WF^c	ECI^e	RRV^f	ZBS^g	RPR^h	RBB^i
$1s2p^2\ ^4P$	5.2526	5.2862	5.2860	5.2453	5.2453	60.7118	59.8927	60.140	60.750	60.74		60.75	60.802
^2D	5.2254	5.2232	5.2356	5.2342		61.4520	61.6071	61.512			61.065	61.065	61.062
^2P	5.2382	5.1930	5.2323	5.2137	5.2137	61.1036	62.4289	61.602					
^2S	5.1761	5.1739	5.1780			62.7935	62.9486	63.079					63.492

^{a}PW results, ^{b}LYP results, ^{c}[36], ^{d}[38, 40], ^{e}[43, 44, 45], ^{f}[49],^{g}[29], ^{h}[31], and ^{i}[34].

TABLE IV: Auger transition energies (ΔE) from inner-shell excited states $1s2s^22p^2\ ^2S$, $^{2,4}P$, and ^2D of B to singly excited states $1s^22s2p\ ^{1,3}P$ and doubly excited states $1s^22p^2\ ^1S$, ^3P, and ^1D of B$^+$.

			ΔE			(eV)	
Initial states	Final states	Present	work	Other		theory	Experiment
		PW^a	LYP^b	WF^c	PZE^d	RPZE^e	RBB^f
$1s2s^22p^2\ ^4P$	$1s^22p^2\ ^3P$	168.3500	169.1008		167.4101	169.10	169.2
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1D$	167.3105	168.5612		166.7952		
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1S$	165.5064	167.2558		163.2454		
^2D	$1s^22p^2\ ^3P$	170.4344	170.7805		169.3045		
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1D$	169.3949	170.2409		168.6895		
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1S$	167.5908	168.9356		165.1397	170.58	170.7
^2P	$1s^22p^2\ ^3P$	170.4181	170.2883	171.5858	169.0290	170.73	170.7
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1D$	169.3786	169.7487		168.4140		
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1S$	167.5745	168.4433		164.8643		
^2S	$1s^22p^2\ ^3P$	172.7828	173.1289		171.0097		
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1D$	171.7433	172.5893		170.3947		
	$1s^22p^2\ ^1S$	169.9392	171.2840		166.8450	169.13	169.2
$1s2s^22p^2\ ^4P$	$1s^22s2p\ ^3P$	176.1516	176.8376		175.7192		
	$1s^22s2p\ ^1P$	171.4249	172.9961		170.8674		
^2D	$1s^22s2p\ ^3P$	178.2360	178.5173		177.6135		
	$1s^22s2p\ ^1P$	173.5093	174.6759	173.2321	172.7617	174.17	174.6
^2P	$1s^22s2p\ ^3P$	178.2197	178.0251		177.3381		
	$1s^22s2p\ ^1P$	173.4930	174.1836	173.4062	172.4862	173.90	174.6
^2S	$1s^22s2p\ ^3P$	180.5843	180.8657		179.3188		
	$1s^22s2p\ ^1P$	175.8577	177.0242		174.4669		

^{a}PW results, ^{b}LYP results, ^{c}[36], ^{d}[50, 51], ^{e}[34], and ^{f}Ref. [34].

TABLE V: Excitation energies (ΔE) for optically allowed transitions of inner-shell excited states of Ne^{k+} ($k = 1 \sim 3$).

			ΔE		(eV)
Ions	Initial State	Final State	Present	work	Others
			PW^a	LYP^b	MCDF^c
Ne$^+$	$1s^22s^22p^5\ ^2P$	$1s2s^22p^6\ ^2S$	848.0278	848.8786	849.48
Ne^{2+}	$1s^22s^22p^4\ ^3P$	$1s2s^22p^5\ ^3P$	853.7724	854.6535	855.16
	^1D	^1P	855.0747	856.3277	856.14
	^1S	^1P	850.1188	851.3728	851.19
Ne^{3+}	$1s^22s^22p^3\ ^4S$	$1s2s^22p^4\ ^4P$	861.0411	861.8325	862.41
	^2D	^2D	862.2075	863.0207	863.33
		^2P	863.1715	863.6460	864.20
	^2P	^2D	858.5203	859.3295	859.78
		^2P	859.4843	859.9549	860.65
		^2S	864.5179	865.3302	865.62

^{a}PW results, ^{b}LYP results, and ^{c}obtained with data in [52].

results to the experimental results are 0.06% and 0.04%, respectively. Thus our LYP results are very close to the RCI results and MCHF results. Furthermore, according to our results the identification of the photoionization spectra $1s2s^22p^63s(^1S)3p\ ^2P$ and $1s2s^22p^63s(^3S)3p\ ^2P$ in the experiment [55] should be exchanged. This result agrees well with the theoretical results of [54] and [53].

For the excitation energy of excited state $1s2s^22p^63s(^3S)3p\ ^2P$, the maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results to the experimental results are 0.22% and 0.16%, respectively, which are a little bit larger than those of RCI and MCHF results to the experimental results. For the excitation energies of excited states $1s2s^22p^63s(^3S)np\ ^2P$ with $n = 4$ and 5, the maximum relative deviations of our PW and LYP results are 0.12% and 0.04% to the RCI results, and 0.18% and 0.10% to the MCHF results, respectively. This demonstrates that our LYP results are very close to the RCI results for these states.

For the excitation energies of excited states $1s2s^22p^63s(^3S)np\ ^4P$, the relative deviations of our PW and LYP results to the RCI results are less than 0.13% and 0.03%, respectively. This illustrates again that our LYP results are in very agreement with the RCI results for these states. For all the excited states the LYP results are better than the PW results. Thus the LYP energy functional is more accurate than the PW energy functional in the excitation energy calculation of inner-shell excited states of atomic systems with large Z.

TABLE VI: Total energies (E) and excitation energies (ΔE) of inner-shell excited states $1s2s^2 2p^6 3s(^1S)np\ ^2P$ and $1s2s^2 2p^6 3s(^3S)np\ ^{2,4}P$ ($n = 3 \sim 8$) of Na. The ground state energies obtained from calculations with PW and LYP correlation potentials and energy functionals are −162.2265 (a.u.) and −162.2687 (a.u.), respectively.

States	$-E$ (a.u.)		ΔE (eV)				
	Present work		Present work		Other theory		Exp.
	PW[a]	LYP[b]	PW[a]	LYP[b]	RCI[c]	MCHF[d]	TLE[e]
$1s2s^2 2p^6 3s(^1S)3p\ ^2P$	122.7947	122.7552	1073.0024	1074.1765	1074.28	1074.50	1074.95
$4p\ ^2P$	122.6680	122.6708	1076.4501	1077.5222	1077.52	1077.96	1078.17
$5p\ ^2P$	122.6378	122.6424	1077.2719	1078.2950	1078.27	1078.60	1078.9
$6p\ ^2P$	122.6246	122.6301	1077.6311	1078.6297			
$7p\ ^2P$	122.6176	122.6234	1077.8215	1078.8120			
$8p\ ^2P$	122.6134	122.6195	1077.9358	1078.9182			
$1s2s^2 2p^6 3s(^3S)3p\ ^2P$	122.7540	122.7714	1074.1099	1074.7847	1075.97	1076.04	1076.47
$4p\ ^2P$	122.6858	122.6976	1075.9657	1076.7929	1077.21	1077.83	
$5p\ ^2P$	122.6601	122.6705	1076.6651	1077.5304	1077.88	1078.56	
$6p\ ^2P$	122.6481	122.6582	1076.9916	1077.8651			
$7p\ ^2P$	122.6414	122.6517	1077.1739	1078.0420			
$8p\ ^2P$	122.6374	122.6478	1077.2828	1078.1481			
$3p\ ^4P$	122.8152	122.8176	1072.4445	1073.5276	1073.87		
$4p\ ^4P$	122.6916	122.6983	1075.8079	1076.7739	1076.94		
$5p\ ^4P$	122.6619	122.6703	1076.6161	1077.5358	1077.71		
$6p\ ^4P$	122.6487	122.6580	1076.9753	1077.8705			
$7p\ ^4P$	122.6418	122.6515	1077.1630	1078.0474			
$8p\ ^4P$	122.6377	122.6476	1077.2746	1078.1535			

[a] PW results, [b] LYP results, [c] [53], [d] [54], and [e] [55].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the procedure developed for excited-state calculation based on the SLHF density functional approach and Slater's diagonal sum rule has been extended to the treatment of inner-shell excited states of atomic systems. In this procedure, the electron spin-orbitals in an electronic configuration are obtained first by solving the KS equation with the exact SLHF exchange potential. Then a single-Slater-determinant energy of the electronic configuration is calculated by using these electron spin-orbitals. Finally, a multiplet energy of an excited state is evaluated from the single-Slater-determinant energies of the electronic configurations involved in terms of Slater's diagonal sum rule. The key part of this procedure is the SLHF exchange potential. We have applied this procedure to the calculations of total energies and excitation energies of inner-shell excited states of open-shell atomic systems: Li, B, Ne^{+}, Ne^{2+}, Ne^{3+}, and Na. The correlation effect is taken care of by incorporating the PW and LYP correlation potentials and energy functionals into calculation. The results from the calculations with LYP and PW energy functionals and energy functionals are in overall good agreement with each other and also with the available more sophisticated *ab initio* theoretical results and experimental data. This demonstrates that the SLHF density-functional approach can provide a simple and computationally efficient approach for the accurate calculation of inner-shell excited states of open-shell atomic systems within DFT.

Acknowledgments

This work is partially supported by the Chemical Sciences, Geosciences and Biosciences Division of the Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Office of Science, U. S. Department of Energy, and by the National Science Foundation.

---

[1] R. G. Parr and W. Yang, *Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1989).
[2] R. M. Dreizler and E. K. U. Gross, *Density functional theory : an approach to the quantum many-body problem* (Springer-Verlag, 1990).
[3] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136**, B864 (1964).
[4] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).
[5] F. D. Sala and A. Görling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 033003 (2002).
[6] A. D. Becke, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 3098 (1988).
[7] J. P. Perdew and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 8800 (1986).
[8] C. Lee, W. Yang, and R. G. Parr, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 785 (1988).
[9] J. P. Perdew and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 13244 (1992).
[10] F. D. Sala and A. Görling, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 5718 (2001).
[11] R. Singh and B. M. Deb, Phys. Rep. **311**, 47 (1999).
[12] M. K. Harbola and V. Sahni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 489 (1989).
[13] V. Sahni, Y. Li, and M. K. Harbola, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 1434 (1992).

[14] A. K. Roy and S. I. Chu, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052508 (2002).
[15] R. Singh and B. M. Deb, J. Chem. Phys. **104**, 5892 (1996).
[16] F. D. Sala and A. Görling, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 10439 (2003).
[17] F. D. Sala and A. Görling, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **91**, 131 (2003).
[18] V. Vitale, F. D. Sala, and A. Görling, J. Chem. Phys. **122**, 244102 (2005).
[19] A. Görling, J. Chem. Phys. **123**, 062203 (2005).
[20] T. Hupp, B. Engels, and A. Görling, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 11591 (2003).
[21] T. Hupp, B. Engels, F. D. Sala, and A. Görling, Z. Phys. Chem. **217**, 133 (2003).
[22] Z. Zhou and S.-I. Chu, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022513 (2005).
[23] J. C. Slater, *Quantum Theory of Atomic Structure, Vol. II* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960).
[24] Z. Zhou and S.-I. Chu, Phys. Rev. A p. Submitted (2006).
[25] J. Wang, S. I. Chu, and C. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 3208 (1994).
[26] C. Pollak, A. Rosa, and E. J. Baerends, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **119**, 7324 (1997).
[27] P. Feldman and R. Novick, Phys. Rev. **160**, 143 (1967).
[28] D. L. Ederer, T. Lucatorto, and R. Madden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 1537 (1970).
[29] P. Ziem, R. Bruch, and N. Stolterfoht, J. Phys. B: Atom. Molec. Phys. **8**, L480 (1975).
[30] D. J. Pegg et al., Phys. Rev. A **12**, 1330 (1975).
[31] D. Rassi, V. Pejčev, and K. J. Ross, J. Phys. B: Atom. Molec. Phys. **10**, 3535 (1977).
[32] T. J. McIlrath and T. B. Lucatorto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1390 (1977).
[33] A. M. Cantù, W. H. Parkinson, G. Tondello, and G. P. Tozzi, J. Opt. Soc. Am. **67**, 1030 (1977).
[34] M. Rødbro, R. Bruch, and P. Bisgaard, J. Phys. B: Atom. Molec. Phys. **12**, 2413 (1979).
[35] H. Mannervik and H. Cederquist, Phys. Scr. **31**, 79 (1985).
[36] A. K. Roy and B. M. Deb, Phys. Lett. A **234**, 465 (1997).
[37] B. F. Davis and K. T. Chung, Phys. Rev. A **29**, 1878 (1984).
[38] B. F. Davis and K. T. Chung, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 111 (1988).
[39] B. F. Davis and K. T. Chung, Phys. Rev. A **39**, 3942 (1989).
[40] M. K. Chen and K. T. Chung, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 1675 (1994).
[41] S. Wakid, A. K. Bhatia, and A. Temkin, Phys. Rev. A **21**, 496 (1980).
[42] A. K. Bhatia and A. Temkin, Phys. Rev. A **13**, 2322 (1976).
[43] C. F. Bunge and A. V. Bunge, Phys. Rev. A **17**, 816 (1978).
[44] C. F. Bunge and A. V. Bunge, Phys. Rev. A **17**, 822 (1978).
[45] C. F. Bunge, Phys. Rev. A **19**, 936 (1979).
[46] C. F. Bunge, J. Phys. B: Atom. Molec. Phys. **14**, 1 (1981).
[47] S. Lunell and N. H. F. Beebe, Phys. Scr. **15**, 268 (1977).
[48] S. Lunell, Phys. Scr. **16**, 13 (1977).
[49] S. Holøien and S. Geltman, Phys. Rev. **153**, 81 (1967).
[50] U. I. Safronova and V. N. Kharitonova, Opt. Spectrosc. **27**, 300 (1969).
[51] E. P. Ivanova and U. I. Safronova, J. Phys. B: Atom. Molec. Phys. **8**, 1591 (1975).
[52] H. Yamaoka et al., Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012709 (2001).
[53] L. Yang, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **26**, 1813 (1993).
[54] V. A. Yavna, I. D. Petrov, L. A. Demekhina, A. N. Khoperskii, and V. L. Sukhorukov, Opt. Spectrosc. **61**, 552 (1986).
[55] M. H. Tuilier, D. Laporte, and J. M. Esteva, Phys. Rev. A **26**, 372 (1982).